

**Scott Traudt** ✓  
@Greenhills303

Follow

#MMTLP #MMTLPfraud #MMTLPParmy #MMTLPfiasco

Another ruling against me in *Traudt v. Rubenstein*, and yes you have to be precise. Read the sections of my 1st Amended Complaint (white) and then read the court's ruling. I did all but challenge FINRA's existence (and did challenge it in other filings) but here's the lesson kiddies: you have to throw everything in. I did not register on the target on FINRA cleanly, only on the oblique. If I missed the mark, I hit it in other filings anyway. But if this starts the process of amending the complaint for the next round, so be it. This is the arena we are fighting in.

39. **FINRA** as a self-regulatory organization (SRO) has no standing under *Pringles v. Raimondo* (US Supreme Ct. #22-451, 2024) and *West Virginia v. EPA* (2022) to maintain the U3 halt and is routinely using powers and authority not delegated to Congress.

40. **FINRA**'s U3 halt was illegal under *West Virginia* as the rarity by which it happens (only three times since the Securities Act of 1934 was passed) and because it is not a "major question" under the revised "major questions" doctrine by which the US Supreme Court reinforces the principle that an administrative agency making policy decisions for Americans when it had no power to do so; it was orchestrated by two Wall Street back benchers and aided and abetted with a group in the room with them with vested financial interest in seeing the shorts removed because of their exposure to catastrophic losses.

41. That **FINRA** has "immunity" from a damage claim as a *private* SRO is impossible to sustain in the wake of *Loper* as the decision was not appealable, was done by a private organization usurping Congressional law making powers, contravenes the clear and unambiguous language of 2010's Dodd-Frank laws, and because as an SRO it was not a government entity; its existence is not called into question – simply impossible for it, and its removal, to not be seen as one.

**Id All Motions to Dismiss and Motions for Arbitration in this case is that if the court declares **FINRA** "illegal," the discovery process will be simplified. (Doc. 39 at 7.) Because Plaintiff does not challenge **FINRA**'s legal status as an organization or exists in reality before the court. See *Connelly v. Ferguson* (2021) ("A claim must be set forth in the pleadings with particularity. Plaintiff further asks the court to hear his dispositive motions filed by Defendants, but he has not requested injunctive relief in his reply brief to another motion. (2024) (6, 245 n.6 (2d Cir. 2024) (noting argument was not made). Plaintiff has not met his burden of showing that a stay is warranted. The proponent of a stay bears the burden of establishing its necessity on 11/5/2024. (This is a text-only Order.) (ejh)**

10:35 AM · 11/5/24 · 3.7K Views



8



30



89



4



Most relevant replies ✓

**Dennis** @DennisTheArtist · 11/5/24

Thanks for trying, oh well, good effort Scott



1



1



196

**Scott Traudt** ✓ @Greenhills303 · 11/5/24

It's not over dude, these aren't important motions. Wildcards.